



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,583	06/15/2005	Mischa Stieger	112701-625	9052
29157 7590 12/17/2008 BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP P.O. Box 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690				
EXAMINER HOGAN, JAMES SEAN				
ART UNIT 3752		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 12/17/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENTS@BELLBOYD.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/538,583

Applicant(s)

STIEGER ET AL.

Examiner

JAMES S. HOGAN

Art Unit

3752

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed September 15, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The instance that the nozzle be disposable and the use of plastics that are compatible to food use are known strategies for qualifying an apparatus for sanitation qualifications and therefore are not qualifying for a patented claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,499,389 to Probst.

As per claim 1, 11 and 12, Probst discloses a nozzle that can be fitted onto the steam outlet (4) of a coffee machine intended to froth a liquid, the nozzle having a mouth (at (3)) for receiving letting in steam, a restriction (3a) in a continuation of the said mouth, and a flared zone (13) along the axis of the said restriction and of the said mouth to allow the liquid out, having a cross section more or less approximately equal to the cross section of the mouth, and a pipe (6) perpendicular to the mouth for allowing in liquid, and an air inlet (8), the air inlet extending from the pipe at an angle of 0°. Probst does not necessarily show the nozzle being made of one piece, nor the material it is made of, however, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 3752

the time the invention was made to have proclaimed a compatible material for the nozzle, (i.e. food grade plastic, e.g. propylene) , since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. See *in re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416, Additionally, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have made the nozzle of one piece, since it has been held that forming in once piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. See *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164 (1893). Further, as Probst does not teach a disposable nozzle piece, doing so is know to be making a piece "portable", and it has been held that making an old device portable or movable without producing any new and expected results involves only routine skill in the art. See *In re Lindberg*, 93 USPQ 23 (CCPA 1952).

As per claim 2, the air inlet is shown (See Figure 1) as part of the pipe.

3. As per claim 3, the air inlet, as best as can be determined, opens at a right angle.
4. As per claim 5, the flared zone is taught to be an emulsifying chamber which by definition would break a jet.
5. As per claim 6, as best as can be determined, a blind ring (17) and settling segment (16) cooperate to create a stabilizing zone at the outlet.
6. As per claim 7, Probst does not teach a specific material for the nozzle, however it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have chosen a desired material, since it has been held to be

within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. See *in re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

As per claims 8-10, Probst does not teach specific sizes for any one piece of the nozzle assembly, however, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize 1-3 mm for the air inlet, 10 to 15 mm for the mouth and 2 to 4mm for the restriction, and 4-20 mm for a stabilization zone, since our reviewing courts have held that where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device. *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3752

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action. \

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES S. HOGAN whose telephone number is (571)272-4902. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 6:00a-3:00p EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Len Tran can be reached on (571)272-1184. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. S. H./

Examiner, Art Unit 3752

/Len Tran/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3752